United Nations ECE/CES/2017/15/Add.1

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2017
English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session
Geneva, 19-21 June 2017
Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016

Addendum

Report of the Joint UNECE / Eurostat Workshop on Implementing the Common Statistical Production Architecture

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The Joint UNECE/Eurostat Workshop on Implementing the Common Statistical Production Architecture was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 22 to 24 June 2016. The workshop was organized in the context of the work of the High-Level Group on the Modernisation of Official Statistics. It aims to promote the use of the Common Statistical Production Architecture to facilitate the sharing of ideas and plans for modernising statistical production, and to identify opportunities for international collaboration activities.

The addendum is the report of that workshop and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians on the implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016 in regards to its outcomes and recommendations.

GE.17-09223(E)
1709223

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Joint UNECE / Eurostat Workshop on Implementing the Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA) was held in Geneva on 22-24 June 2016. It was jointly organized with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and an organizing committee with members from Australia, Canada, Kyrgyzstan, Netherlands, Sweden and the Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat).

2. The workshop was attended by representatives of the statistical offices of Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Singapore, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States as well as by representatives of the European Central Bank, Eurostat, International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), Eurasian Economic Commission, OECD, Statistical, Economic and Social Research and Training Centre for Islamic Countries (SESRIC), University of Bergen, and Cybernetica AS.

3. Ms. Lidia Bratanova, Director of the UNECE Statistical Division, welcomed participants, and Mr. Robert McLellan of Canada was elected as chair of the workshop.

4. The keynote presentation, by Mr. Emanuele Baldacci (Eurostat), outlined the need for substantial global strategic thinking regarding statistical production processes and the benefits of implementation initiatives like CSPA. CSPA allows statistical organizations to work together to identify gaps in production processes, share their knowledge to add new capabilities, and work together to innovate.

5. The agenda included the following substantive sessions, the outcomes of which are documented in the annex:

(a) CSPA Training;

(b) Hackathon;

(c) Presentations of CSPA-related initiatives;

(d) Break-out sessions by discipline on topics relating to CSPA.

6. All background documents and presentations for the workshop are available at www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/CSPA/CSPA+Implementation+Workshop+2016:

- Agreement to conduct CSPA workshops regularly in the future;
- Further Hackathon initiatives, either face to face or virtually;
- Creation of a common brand and pronunciation ("see-spa");
- Increased communication and transparency in order to share experiences;
- A summary document, ideally in all United Nations languages, to be used for statistical conferences and marketing activities, explaining the business value of CSPA;
- More capacity building activities;
- Further development of the Logical Information Model;
- More methodological input on the issue of the optimal granularity of services;
- Work towards common principles for platforms and technologies;
- More guidance for business analysts (top down) and software architects / developers (bottom-up);

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the meeting

A. Session 1: CSPA training

7. This session was facilitated by Mr. Matjaz Jug (Netherlands), Pierre Peyronnel (Eurostat) and Steven Vale (UNECE). It included the following presentations:

- Introduction to the "Modernstats" Initiative and the key models and standards for the modernization of official statistics – Steven Vale;
- The Common Statistical Production Architecture as the basis for future statistical production – Steven Vale;
- Beyond services: Shared capabilities and catalogues – Steven Vale;
- Presentation and demonstration of the CSPA service catalogue – Pierre Peyronnel;
- Applying the CSPA approach in Statistics Netherlands – Matjaz Jug.

8. After the presentations, participants split into groups to discuss the perceived benefits and challenges of applying CSPA in statistical organizations before discussing the outcomes in plenary.

1. Perceived benefits

- Reduced cost due to increased efficiency and faster information transfer for data sharing;
- Standardisation of technology and platforms allows close alignment of systems across organizations;
- Exchanging methods and sharing of knowledge and documentation can get innovations and ideas to a wider audience;
- Easier to move to new components and replace old components, therefore increasing flexibility regarding statistical needs. At the same time, components created are more sustainable over time as required updates are not too frequent.

2. Perceived challenges

- CSPA implementation may bring increased complexity that is difficult to implement from a technical and business point of view;
- CSPA may require a big investment before any payoff is seen;
- Cultural and language barriers might make international cooperation and communication difficult;
- The required skills must be identified and training provided where needed;
- The transformation to CSPA could be a big and complex step.

3. Security issues

9. The following points were raised in questions, and were addressed by the facilitators:

- Is there the need to implement GSBPM before implementing CSPA? - CSPA services are described in relation to GSIM and GSBPM terminology, which is why

the implementation of these two standards would make the transition to CSPA much easier;

- Where to start with implementation? – On-going work on a modernisation roadmap and modernisation maturity models will provide a good starting point. Many organizations have started by describing current processes according to GSBPM phase and sub-processes in terms of this standard and then identify similarities between organizations;
- How to convince top managers? - The CSPA website offers material for senior managers, but convincing management is indeed a challenge that can be most easily tackled if many organizations participate in the implementation together;
- How can CSPA be made more accessible so that it is easier to grasp, navigate and visualise? Materials to communicate with subject-matter groups, as well as information on implementation experiences and good practices would be useful.

B. Session 2: Hackathon

10. The goal of the CSPA Hackathon was to create concrete deliverables and present them to the CSPA workshop on the 2nd day. The Hackathon was led by David Barraclough (OECD), who also presented the outcomes.

11. Challenges included the fact that this was the first time a CSPA Hackathon had been attempted, and deciding what exactly to work on. The limited time available meant that efficient teamwork was required. These challenges were overcome because all participants were adaptable and came to the Hackathon prepared with ideas. Grouping of similar ideas resulted in outputs in the following areas:

- Architectural models for the orchestration of services;
- Moving from a business process to service implementation;
- Guidelines for the creation of a CSPA enterprise architecture platform;
- Guidelines for the creation of a CSPA platform to support the production process of statistical information.

C. Session 3: Presentations of CSPA-related initiatives

12. This session was led by Robert McLellan (Canada). It included the following presentations:

- Eurostat: Business Case National Accounts Production System – Services (NAPS-S) project - Daniel Suranyi;
- Eurostat: Enterprise Architecture Reference Framework - Jean-Marc Museux;
- Eurostat: Validation Architecture including CSPA compliant validation services - Vincent Tronet;
- France: ESSNet Sharing Common Functionalities - Franck Cotton and Benoit Rouppert;
- Activities and issues from the CSPA Implementation Group;
- Mexico: INEGI plans for CSPA - Juan Munoz;
- Slovenia: The Role of Service Granularity in Successful CSPA Realisation - Zvone Klun;

- Canada: CSPA Activities and Confidentiality-on-the-Fly – Robert McLellan;
- Italy: Adopting CSPA and CORE in Istat: the role of enterprise architecture - Mauro Bruno;
- UNECE: Dissemination service - Marlen Jigitekov;
- OECD: Common Statistical Production Architecture – Where are we - Bruno Urban;
- Eurostat: Development of new IS architecture: IS4STAT input hall and its process manager, using CSPA compliant services - Pierre Peyronnel and Daniel Suranyi.

13. The following points were raised in the discussions:

- Further discussion regarding intellectual property and shareability is necessary soon;
- Important to start thinking about the integration of commercial products;
- To ensure progress, the priorities of the CSPA Implementation Group have to align with priorities of statistical organizations;
- How to systematically identify common required services and the scope of sharing? We have a palette of components and hopefully can relate that to technology and business needs;
- How is optimal granularity defined? Could a board of experts look at the advantages and disadvantages in order to identify the right level at which to define services?
- It is important that the user understands the building blocks. Those building blocks can further provide guidance without being too descriptive as they set a frame for the services;
- Gaps in the portfolio of available CSPA services need time to be filled.

D. Session 4: Break-out sessions by discipline on topics relating to CSPA

14. Participants were divided into the following groups in order to answer three key questions:

- Methodologists/Metadata and Subject-Matter Group, facilitated by Alice Born, Klas Blomqvist, Dan Gillman and Claude Poirier;
- Architects and IT Specialists Group, facilitated by Jean-Marc Museux, Hubertus Cloodt and Daniel Suranyi;
- Senior Management Group, facilitated by Steven Vale and Heini Salonen.

15. During the following plenary session, answers to common questions discussed by the three groups were presented:

What does CSPA mean for your specialism? How do you think it will change the way you work?

- CSPA is a communication tool that allows for a common language;
- It allows conversations to identify services needed;
- Skill sets can be combined to develop new capabilities;
- It reinforces the concept of service provider;
- CSPA allows identification of shared investment opportunities;
- Better coordination of timing for service delivery to meet the needs of users.

What more is needed to support CSPA adoption and use? What additional artefacts/guidance/support/communication materials would be useful to promote its implementation?

- It is important to adjust the ratio of specialisms in the room in order to have a more balanced conversation;
- Senior management support is essential. CSPA should be included in organizational strategy;
- Technical assistance is required on a national and sub-regional level;
- A summary paper would support tailored communication. A list of services to produce, including a development plan and schedule, would provide for more structured information;
- A common understanding of "service" is needed;
- Success stories can motivate people to learn, and should be spread to a wider audience through marketing and publicity at statistical conferences;
- Discussions should continue through face to face meetings.

What are the remaining barriers to CSPA implementation? How can we overcome these barriers?

- Easier access to a common catalogue will ease communication and understanding;
- Ensure future proofing e.g. integrated data sources, GIS and data warehouses;
- Organizational and cultural change may be needed to implement CSPA;
- Public funding restrictions pose difficulties for large investments in many countries.

United Nations ECE/CES/2017/15/Add.2

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2017

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session
Geneva, 19-21 June 2017
Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016

Addendum

Report of the Seminar on Poverty Measurement

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The Seminar on Poverty Measurement was held on 12-13 July in Geneva, Switzerland.

The addendum is the report of that Seminar and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians on the implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016 in regards to its outcomes and recommendations.

GE.17-09226(E)

1709226

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The UNECE Seminar on Poverty Measurement was held on 12-13 July 2016 at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland. It was attended by participants from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, and Uzbekistan. The European Commission was represented by Eurostat and the European Union's Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU-FRA). Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-Stat), the Eurasian Economic Commission, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank were present. Experts from Oxford University (United Kingdom) participated at the invitation of the UNECE secretariat.

2. A number of participants could attend the Seminar thanks to the financial support from Russian Federation and the United Nations Development Account.

II. Organization of the seminar

3. Ms. Trudi Renwick of the United States Census Bureau was elected as Chair of the meeting.

4. The following topics were discussed at the meeting:

(a) Guide on poverty measurement;

(b) Measurement challenges in consumption and income poverty;

(c) Country cases in poverty measurement;

(d) Comparability issues in measuring multidimensional poverty;

(e) Linkages between poverty, inequality and vulnerability;

(f) Communicating statistics on poverty and inequality;

(g) Poverty and inequality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;

(h) Discussion on future work.

5. The following participants acted as Discussants: for item (b) Mr Thomas Christin (Swiss Federal Statistical Office), for item (c) Mr Minh Cong Nguyen (World Bank), for item (d) Ms Elena Danilova-Cross (UNDP), for item (e) Mr Bilal Malaeb (Oxford University), for item (f) Mr Tengiz Tsekvava (National Statistics Office of Georgia), and for item (g) Ms Ala Negruta (National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova).

6. The discussion at the meeting was based on papers that are available on the UNECE website.[1]

7. The meeting took place back-to-back to the Workshop on harmonisation of poverty statistics, 11 July 2016.

[1] http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=41290#/

III. Recommendations for future work

8. Participants appreciated the exchange of experience and good practice at this Seminar as well as at the two previous seminars on poverty measurement organized by UNECE in 2013 and 2015. To strengthen this exchange and its link to methodological work, the meeting proposed to establish a regular forum in the form of expert meetings on measuring poverty and inequality.

9. The expert meetings will be prepared by a steering group composed of a few member countries. The Steering Group will also formulate proposals for advancing methodological work on measuring poverty and inequality, and will follow up on the implementation of methodological guidance.

10. The meeting recommended that the 2017 UNECE expert meeting on measuring poverty and inequality will be organized in April-July 2017.

11. Participants agreed that the 2017 expert meeting should address:

(a) The UNECE regional needs for the poverty and inequality indicators for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the strengthening of the role of official statistics in this area;

(b) New methodological work following up on the issues raised in the UNECE Guide on Poverty Measurement, such as:

i. Comparable indexes of multidimensional poverty: indicators and data requirements

ii. Measurement of vulnerability to poverty

iii. Potential for producing individual level poverty measures

iv. Income and poverty measures for population outside private households

v. Measurement of components of income and wealth, including social transfers and own production

vi. Spatial patterns of poverty

vii. Subjective poverty;

(c) Harmonization of household surveys;

(d) Methodological issues in measuring economic inequalities;

(e) Gender, age and minority group disaggregation of indicators of poverty and inequality.

12. It was agreed that for the next meeting, sessions would be prepared by a designated organizer who would also be the discussant. The Steering Group will elaborate the proposal for topics for the 2017 expert meeting and will ask for volunteers to organize the sessions.

IV. Adoption of the report of the meeting

13. The present report was adopted during the closing session.

14. A summary of the discussion in the substantive sessions of the meeting will be presented in the annex of this report, to be prepared by the Secretariat after the meeting.

Annex

Summary of the main issues discussed at the Seminar on poverty measurement

I. Introduction

1. The meeting began with a brief introduction from the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division bringing the attention to the meaning of poverty on a global scale and in the context of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) monitoring. The speaker explained the importance of finding the balance between striving for international comparability and responding to country specific economic, social and institutional needs. The methodological issues and gaps to be addressed by the experts should be aligned with the regional priorities and respond to the countries demands. The establishment of a Steering Group will help to identify the country needs and tackle concrete issues on poverty measurement. The speaker acknowledged the progress made by the Task Force on preparing the Guide on poverty measurement and highlighted its potentially global use.

2. Mr. Andres Vikat, Chief of the Social and Demographic Statistics Section of the UNECE Statistical Division opened the Seminar and explained its role in the context of activities of the Conference of European Statisticians.

3. The first presentation was given by the Chair of the UNECE Task Force on Poverty Measurement, Ms. Anna Bieńkuńska from Poland. She reported on progress made in the preparation of the Guide on poverty measurement and noted the next steps. She underlined the main objective of the Guide to provide recommendations for improving the international comparability and availability of statistics on poverty and the related metadata.

4. The Task Force's Chair introduced the four substantive chapters. In particular, chapter 1 "Conceptual background" provides a general description of the poverty phenomenon and poverty related concepts such as vulnerability to poverty, population at risk of poverty, inequality, social inclusion. Chapter 2 "Monetary poverty" addresses the monetary approach to poverty, and in particular, the traditional income and consumption expenditure measures that are the most commonly used approach to measuring poverty. Chapter 3 "Subjective poverty" aims to introduce the concept of subjective poverty and its methods of measurement. Chapter 4 „Multidimensional poverty" addresses the measurement of the non-monetary aspects of poverty and social exclusion and demonstrates their relevance for policy design and analysis at global, regional and national levels. The speaker noted that the main challenge in front of the Task Force is to stay focused on the practical aspects and to draft the recommendations. Next steps include finalization of the chapters, editing the content and the preparation of recommendations. The Guide should be finalized among the Task Force members by October 2016 and be ready for submission to the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians by December 2016.

II. Discussion at the substantive sessions

5. The Seminar covered six substantive topics: "Measurement challenges in consumption and income poverty", "Country cases in poverty measurement", "Comparability issues in measuring multidimensional poverty", "Linkages between poverty, inequality, and vulnerability", "Communicating statistics on poverty and inequality" and "Poverty and inequality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". A variety of speakers from national statistical offices and government agencies, leading researchers from Oxford University, representatives of World Bank, Eurostat and other

international organizations, made presentations and provided papers as a basis for the discussions. The respective chapter leaders under the *Guide on poverty measurement* presented the draft chapters of the Guide for discussion and comments. The summary of the discussions is below.

A. Measurement challenges in consumption and income poverty

6. This session consisted of presentations from the Task Force on poverty measurement, the United States of America, the World Bank and Eurostat. Discussion was led by the representative of Switzerland.

7. The representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the Task Force on poverty measurement, outlined the content of the draft chapter on monetary poverty in the *Guide on poverty measurement*. It was emphasised that the chapter does not yet contain recommendations as these are to be discussed by the Task Force in their next meeting. The presenter posed questions for feedback regarding areas not yet addressed or without enough detail; areas requiring examples; main conclusions; unresolved issues and ideas for a future research agenda.

8. The representative of the United States of America described the development and use of the supplemental poverty measure (SPM) used in the USA to complement the official poverty measure, which has clear and recognised drawbacks. The SPM is used to estimate the value of social transfers or in-kind benefits. The presentation outlined some of the measurement challenges surrounding these estimates and described work to improve the measure and its use.

9. A representative of the World Bank gave a presentation on the topic of imputing rent values to include them in aggregate welfare measures. The reasons for needing to do this are that significant utility is derived from occupying a dwelling; rent is a major part of consumption and welfare; and rent makes up a high share of expenses. A variety of possible methods available for imputing rent were reviewed in order to reach a proposed methodology based on econometric methods, attempting to account for bias in data sources. Empirical testing of the method through application to Georgian data was presented. A comparison of imputed and reported rents was made, and their effects on poverty lines and rates were examined.

10. A presentation made by the United Kingdom began by explaining the relative advantages and disadvantages for using income, consumption, material deprivation and wealth as measures of poverty. Economic well-being is derived from all four of these and as such, consideration of multiple measures together might give the best insights for policy intervention. No single data source is available for all four components in the UK, so a method was described in which statistical matching techniques were used to combine datasets from two surveys. Once matched, the relationships between the different components of economic poverty were analysed. There is clear evidence of a close (but non-identical) relationship between both income and expenditure measures of poverty and other measures of well-being, but different degrees of overlap in different countries highlight the fact that they each measure something distinct. Looking at wealth along with income can permit better analysis of vulnerability. Analysis of income and wealth together makes it possible to identify within at risk of poverty population those with/without savings buffer. It also allows for identification of 'asset poor only' who may be vulnerable to sudden fall in income.

11. A presentation by Eurostat described five current strands of work to modernise the Survey of Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), with a particular focus on work to improve the collection of data on material deprivation. This includes updating the list of items which are considered "socially necessary", such that an inability of a household to afford them suggests material deprivation (since ownership of items such as a colour

television is now so close to universal that it no longer has discriminatory power). A new focus on personal-level deprivation allows analysis of intra-household differences in deprivation, which in some cases are quite large.

12. The following points were made in the discussion:

(a) Many difficulties of deciding on common criteria for defining consumption and income poverty exist, even bearing in mind that this alone is only one component of overall poverty that is multidimensional. These challenges underlie the difficulty in formulating recommendations for the relevant chapter of the UNECE Guide. As the UK paper illustrated, the range of different components reflect related but non-identical underlying mechanisms. It was therefore questioned whether it is necessary or appropriate to develop a single set of criteria.

(b) Underreporting is a serious issue and correcting for it is a big challenge. Gathering data at sub-national level for some of the benefits programmes is a major challenge, especially to do it in a timely way. Other measurement issues include taking account of tax rebates (benefits given through less taxation), distinguishing poverty as a temporary phenomenon or as lower living standards, which income in-kind to include and which to exclude, etc.

(c) Participants noted the need to develop simplified measures that can take into account people not covered in large surveys, e.g. people in institutions and homeless people.

B. Country cases in poverty measurement

13. This session consisted of presentations from Belarus, Ukraine, and Russian Federation. Discussion was led by the World Bank.

14. The representative from Belarus presented on the methods of poverty assessment in their country. The household living standards survey is the main source of information about poverty for both the population as a whole and households. The sample covers 6000 households, which is 0.2 per cent of the population. The poverty concepts applied in Belarus include absolute and relative poverty, subjective poverty and material deprivation. Furthermore, the speaker explained the methodology for calculation of the main indicator of well-being – average per capita household disposable resources, including the use of the national equivalence scale. The poverty line is calculated as minimum subsistence, with food items representing 55 per cent of the overall subsistence minimum budget and non-food items 77 per cent of the food items. Relative poverty line is defined as 60 per cent of median national disposable resources per capita, using the equivalence scale.

15. The delegate from Ukraine spoke about monitoring different poverty forms in their country. The survey sample of the household living conditions survey in Ukraine covers about 13,000 households. The response rate is 80 per cent. As in other countries in the region, absolute poverty line is based on subsistence minimum. In addition, for the purpose of MDG reporting, a poverty line of US$5 per capita a day by purchasing power parity (expenditure based) is estimated. The following relative poverty thresholds are used: 75 per cent of median of equalized monthly expenditures is set as a relative poverty threshold and 60 per cent of median - as extreme poverty threshold. A national approach on deprivation poverty is characterized by the limited possibilities of the population to access certain benefits, including basic physiological needs, needs attributed to personal development and adequate level of comfort. Deprivation poverty line is defined as a presence of at least 4 out of 18 deprivation items. The results of analysis of population's material deprivation using both national and European approaches were presented. Finally, the speaker outlined the perspective directions, objectives and problems related to improvements to measurement of poverty, inequality and social exclusion.

16. A speaker from Russian Federation presented recent efforts in assessing deprivation across country regions in attempt to address large inter-regional differences. The main differences between poverty and average level of welfare were focused on several aspects of life, in particular culture and leisure, current consumptions, provision with housing and property, education services, and medical services. Some new developments included an introduction of a relative poverty line and a rate based on the OECD standards, introduction of a two-level poverty measurement based on indicators of monetary and total household income, and the extension of indicators for describing poverty profiles. Efforts have been made to ensure data comparability in the long-term. The speaker explained the difference between the material deprivations approach in EU countries and Russian Federation.

17. The following points were made in the discussion:

- Only certain poverty measures and indicators are communicated to policy makers. For example, absolute poverty, in particular the minimum subsistence poverty line, is the measure that is mostly used at the level of policy. Other poverty data are usually used by researchers or by experts to analyse the effects of different social programmes.
- The participants pointed the need for addressing the issue of poverty in the context of SGDs monitoring.
- Relative poverty is considered rather as an internationally comparable measure and is in general used for analytical purposes rather than policy.
- The presented countries produce poverty data on a quarterly basis.
- In countries with big territories, applying the deprivation approach is complicated because of large sub-national differences.
- It is difficult to provide estimates on salary in-kind (e.g. transport discounts).
- The list of deprivations is different across the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, e.g. 14 deprivations in Belarus and 18 in Ukraine. Moreover, the process of compiling the list of deprivations is different in each country, also regarding the various consultation rounds.

C. Comparability issues in measuring multidimensional poverty

18. This session consisted of presentations the Task Force on poverty measurement and the Republic of Moldova.

19. The presentation from OPHI, on behalf of the Task Force on poverty measurement, outlined the content of the draft chapter in the *Guide on poverty measurement* on multidimensional poverty, including material deprivation. This presentation focused on the development of the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), an index intended to take into account non-monetary factors to arrive at a more broad view of poverty. Specifically, the motivation for the development of the MPI was discussed along with a technical description of the required steps to calculate this measure. Lastly, several examples and recommendations on the use of the MPI and its underlying methodology were presented.

20. The presentation from the Republic of Moldova focused on the experience of the National Bureau of Statistics of Moldova in its efforts to measure multidimensional poverty. The speaker provided background on the indicators historically used by the Republic of Moldova and the motivation for moving beyond measuring only monetary poverty. She presented survey results on material deprivation, population at risk of poverty and population in low work intensity households, in comparison with monetary poverty indicators.

21. The following points were made in the discussion:

- The multidimensional poverty indicators represent better the multifaceted nature of poverty as specified in the SDGs.
- Several participants reported on their current or planned use of various forms of the MPI.
- While noting the MPI's usefulness, some highlighted the challenges in the international comparability of the MPI given differences across countries in data availability.
- The participants debated whether determinants and symptoms of poverty should be included in the same index and noted the importance of distinguishing between social exclusion and multidimensional poverty.
- There was strong support for introducing multidimensional poverty measure in the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucuses and Central Asia. With this approach, however, there is need for decisions at policy level on dimensions, indicators and thresholds. It is therefore necessary to explain to the experts from ministries and state agencies the meaning of multidimensional poverty in accessible language. A handbook or a small set of Guidelines would be helpful in this respect.

D. Linkages between poverty, inequality, and vulnerability

22. This session consisted of presentations from Poland, Russian Federation, CIS-Stat and World Bank. Discussion was led by the OPHI.

23. The speaker from Poland presented the social perception of poverty and income inequalities in Poland based on their Social Cohesion Survey conducted in 2015. The survey covered questions on the perception of the Polish society on the number of poor and rich in the country, including a break down by the income quintile of the respondents. The survey also reported results on the percentage of Polish inhabitants that personally know poor and rich people, on the role of the state in reducing poverty and income inequalities in Poland, and on the kind of social assistance and the type of recipients (families with many children, old age, single parents, disabled, living in difficult housing conditions). The presenter concluded that the systematic collection of data regarding social perception of the socio-economic reality could be very useful in a context of social dialogue as well as creating, verification and monitoring of social policies aimed at improving the quality of life and social cohesion.

24. A representative from Russian Federation introduced the methodological developments in measuring inequality and poverty during the transition to new sources of information. The Russian Federal State Statistics Service produces indicators on income distribution statistics since 1970 and on poverty since 1992. Previously (before 1992) the data source for these statistics was a special sample population income survey (PIS) covering 170 000 households. In 1992 it changed to a household budget survey covering 48 000 households and starting in 2017 a transition is being made to a new annual survey on population income and participation in social programs covering 60 000 households (160 000 households every 5 years). The methodological principles of the new survey were developed taking into account relevant international guiding principles and tested. Comparisons were made of the preliminary estimates with the macroeconomic indicators. The introduction of PIS provides new opportunities in terms of information and analytical capacity, consistency in terms of estimates, and sustainability in terms of indicator quality.

25. CIS-Stat presented on the poverty and inequality in the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The main purpose of statistical measurement of poverty in the CIS countries is to determine the headcount of people requiring social

support. Therefore, the most commonly applied concept is absolute monetary poverty, which for the vast majority of countries is the subsistence minimum. Some countries use relative poverty for official poverty estimates. Most CIS countries use consumption aggregates or income as well-being measures for construction of the distribution series. The national poverty estimates, however, cannot be used for comparisons across countries due to the different methodologies. Similar is the situation with inequality measures, where the CIS countries use various approaches to study inequality, such as Gini coefficient, population distribution by income per capita to expenditures and distribution of total monetary income/expenditures by demographic groups. In addition to economic inequality, a cross-country comparison was presented with regard to education and health inequalities, both of which are growing in the CIS countries.

26. The representative from the World Bank introduced an example of high frequency welfare monitoring from Tajikistan. Tajikistan was chosen for a project as country vulnerable to various shocks, including climate shocks (temperature variations from the lowest to the highest in the world) and very high percentage of remittances (45 per cent of GDP). The main goal of the project was to monitor important vulnerabilities at higher frequency, such as migration and remittances, public services as electricity and water, subjective wellbeing, employment, wages and income. In this project, for the first time the poverty rate of Tajikistan was estimated using a national Household Budget Survey (HBS) from the Agency on Statistics.

27. The following points were made in the discussion:

- The use of social perception to complement objective measures is becoming increasingly important. It is also useful in the context of measuring sustainable development.
- The need for work on integration of data from different sources such as administrative data, environment surveys, and economic statistics was underlined.
- The role of the international organizations was considered important in identifying issues of common interest for possible future work on improving comparability.
- The methodology used by World Bank to measure poverty in Tajikistan could be applied in other interested countries. More information can be found on World Bank website.
- In addition to harmonisation of methodologies and data sources, the quality of the survey also matters to ensure comparability across countries.
- Subjective well-being is not only about satisfaction but also about trust, values, etc. Adding more social questions to the economic aspects is necessary to provide a more comprehensive picture of the multidimensional poverty.
- The presentation from Poland covered only part of the survey. The social cohesion surveys are also used to estimate living conditions in general. For example, based on this type of survey conducted in 2011, Poland has published "Quality of life. Social capital, poverty and social exclusion in Poland"[2].

E. Communicating statistics on poverty and inequality

28. This session consisted of two presentations by the World Bank. Discussion was led by Georgia.

[2] Available at: http://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/living-conditions/living-conditions/quality-of-life-social-capital-poverty-and-social-exclusion-in-poland,4,1.html

29. The first presentation was on tools for data visualization. The speaker noted that the availability of household survey data allows national statistics offices to monitor welfare and advise policymakers in a more timely and frequent manner. Moreover, the availability of new channels of communication allows national statistics offices to reach out to a broader audience with large heterogeneity in terms of interest and knowledge. To facilitate this dialogue, the World Bank shared their experience on how to communicate and visualize data through interactive dashboards that summarize key trends and characteristics in the data in an easy understandable way.

30. The second presentation discussed data access. Even though countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia are data rich compared to countries in other regions, access to data (in terms of both timeliness and availability) continues to be an issue in many countries. The presentation touched upon issues related to legislation, anonymization and documentation (which seem to be the main constrains/sources of concern among clients when it comes to making their data public), showcasing best practices both within and outside the region.

31. The following points were made in the discussion:

- Visualization is important to be adapted to different types of users as they have different goals.
- The choice of software depends on price and the possibility to receive international organizations assistance; traditional .xls files are still preferred by users, as it is easy to work with.
- Data sharing is not easy as the metadata are prepared by the best employees who are usually overworked. The documentation process should start immediately after collecting data and even as the survey is being planned. The memory is then the freshest and the production of metadata is much less time consuming.
- Sometimes the persons responsible to producing the metadata are not the individuals specifically assigned for the survey work and in some cases this task is given even to IT people. That worsens the metadata quality.
- Dissemination and anonymization policies need to be clearly defined. The trade-off between anonymisation and utility is important. The business companies for example are usually asking for individual data and anonymisation substantially decreases the utility for them.
- It is useful to visualize the data in all cases and despite the type of software that is being used. This includes providing some important key indicators and explanation on how the data and/or indicators were produced. Country practices on illustration and visualisation tools are welcome.
- The United States shared experience is using researchers in reviewing their software.

F. Poverty and inequality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

32. The session was based on presentation from EU-FRA and UNDP. Discussion was led by the Republic of Moldova.

33. The presentation from EU-FRA described the organization's recent work to collect data on Roma through surveys. The results of an earlier survey show elevated risks of poverty for Roma in countries analysed and highlight the specific challenges faced when collecting measures of poverty for this group. The UN Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR) framework for a fundamental rights based approach was

connected to structure, process and outcome indicators for Roma. EU-FRA underlined the importance of applying this framework to the SDGs as a way to heighten their policy relevance and effectiveness.

34. The paper from UNDP focused on the measurement of inequality in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, specifically those receiving assistance from UNDP. The speaker presented an analysis of changes over time in income inequality in the region using several different indicators. More targeted studies from the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Turkey were also presented. Overall, the results of these analyses show that income inequality seems to be decreasing in recent years and that the number of people in the region living in poverty has decreased significantly. However, UNDP also highlighted the data gaps and uncertainties in the data and noted specific challenges in collecting data for several countries. The specific challenge of nonresponse in cities (and by proxy from the more wealthy) was also addressed as a potential evidence of underestimation of income and of bias in wealth inequality data.

35. The following points were made in the discussion:

- It is important to align any poverty indicators produced by the countries to the SDGs. In addition, for each indicator, the data related aspects of disaggregation and dissemination (e.g. reporting done by the country or the international organizations) should be discussed in the context of SDGs.
- The process of setting out the monitoring system for the ethnic minorities at European level could serve as a model for the indicators' structure. The SDGs indicators could be similarly structured, e.g. policy and institutional development indicators or process and outcome indicators.
- The indicators should be carefully selected. The Gini coefficient for example is accessible indicator but at the same time is one of the most difficult indicators from policy perspective. The experts need to think of indicators that have baseline and targets.
- The challenges in harmonizing data for international comparisons are high, though the EU-SILC was noted as an example showing that such harmonization is possible. UNECE will be working with CIS countries in upcoming years on this issue. The aim is to improve the level of harmonisation and not to harmonise each question.
- Some participants noted that there is still confusion on the division of labour between international and national organizations in measuring SDG indicators for countries. A CES steering group is currently developing a Road Map on statistics for SDGs in cooperation with countries in the UNECE region. This road map will be available in 2017.

United Nations ECE/CES/2017/15/Add.3

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2017

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session
Geneva, 19-21 June 2017
Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016

Addendum

Report of the Workshop on Human Resources Management and Training: Developing Capabilities for the Future

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The Workshop on Human Resources Management and Training: Developing Capabilities for the Future was held in Krakow, from 7-9 September 2016.

The addendum is the report of that workshop and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians on the implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016 in regards to its outcomes and recommendations.

GE.17-09232(E)
1709232

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Workshop on Human Resources Management and Training: Developing Capabilities for the Future was held in Krakow, from 7-9 September 2016. It was prepared by representatives of the Modernisation Committee on Organisational Framework and Evaluation. The workshop was attended by representatives from 34 countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The European Commission was represented by Eurostat. Representatives from the following international organizations also attended: European Free Trade Associated (EFTA), Eurasian Economic Commission (EEC) and United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).

2. Mr. Steven Vale (UNECE) opened the meeting and Mr. Dominik Rozkrut, the president of the Central Statistical Office of Poland welcomed participants. He stressed importance of exchange of good practices in the domain of human resources management and training. He wished participants fruitful discussions during the Workshop.

3. Ms. Jackey Mayda, of Statistics Canada, chaired the workshop.

4. All background documents and presentations for the workshop are available at: http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=41259#/

5. Proposals to consider for future work included:

   (a) Measure of return on investment; training impact; effect on people; organisations;

   (b) Competency profiles for managers and specialists; link to the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM);

   (c) Key skills for statisticians; motivation;

   (d) Coaching for managers / employees;

   (e) Common e-learning courses / webinars;

   (f) HR knowledge exchange platform / exchange of best practices;

   (g) Communication: horizontal / vertical & transparency.

II. Organization of the workshop

6. Ms. Jackey Mayda (Statistics Canada) chaired the workshop.

7. The participants adopted the agenda of the workshop.

8. The following substantive topics were discussed at the workshop:

   (a) Session 1: Opening session;

   (b) Session 2: Practical training and learning materials and methods;

   (c) Session 3: Staff motivation/employee engagement;

   (d) Session 4: Managing human resources in the context of modernization;

(e) Session 5: Organisational barriers to international cooperation in the context of HRMT;

(f) Session 6: Capabilities development;

(g) Session 7: Summary of the workshop and concluding remarks;

(h) Session 8: Special session for the EECCA countries: How to attract competent staff and to provide accurate training for the future development of staff.

9. Session Chairs were Ms. Jackey Mayda (Statistics Canada, session 1,7 and 8), Mr. Antonio Ottaiano (Istat, session 2), Ms. Anna Borowska (CSO of Poland, session 3), Mr. Fabrizio Rotundi (Istat, session 4), Ms. Thana Chrissanthaki (Eurostat, session 5), Mr. Wouter Jan van Muiswinkel (Statistics Netherlands, session 6).

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the workshop

A. Session 1: Opening session

10. During this session UNECE presented the activities of the High Level Group for the Modernisation of Official Statistics (HLG-MOS). The following standards were presented: Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM), Generic Activity Model for Statistical Organization (GAMSO), Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM) and Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA).

11. The members of the Modernisation Committee on Organisational Framework and Evaluation presented activities of the committee: Guidelines for managers, Guidelines on Risk Management practices in National Statistical Organisations and Big data skills profiles for the team and team leader.

12. The following points were raised during the discussions:

(a) It was stressed that the activities of the Modernisation Committee are very open, and it is possible to join them;

(b) All participants were encouraged to provide comments on both guidelines;

(c) Changing job titles from "Statistician" to "Data Analyst" can help to hire a person with the right profile;

(d) Big Data are part of the continuous process of change. We need to look for different sources of data to compile official statistics. We need high quality statistics, and a culture change.

B. Session 2: Poster Session: Practical training and learning materials and methods

13. This session included the following poster presentations:

(a) Renewing organisational culture and procedures by developing management and supervisory work: Sanni Jormakka and Hanna Barlund, Statistics Finland;

(b) E-learning platform and innovative teaching methods in ISTAT: prepared by Tiziana Carrino and presented by Antonio Ottaiano, Istat;

(c) Restoration of the Statistics Agency Training centre: Jumakhon Alikhonov, Statistical Agency under President of the Republic of Tajikistan;

(d) Upskilling of staff in state statistics bodies of the Republic of Belarus: Olga Pozharitskaya, National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus;

(e) Training paths: the one to one techniques: Pietro Scalisi, Istat.

14. Participants were invited to visit the poster presentation stands, where the presentations were delivered by the authors of the poster.

C. Session 3: Applications of System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) and their communication

15. The following five topics were presented:

(a) An organisational development plan focused on people – increasing staff satisfaction and motivation: Paulo Alfonso, Statistics Portugal;

(b) Retention possibilities of Y generation staff in the Hungarian Central Statistical Office: Gabor Csutoras, Hungarian Central Statistical Office;

(c) Possibilities of influence on identification of staff with Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic: Branislav Ostrozlik, Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic;

(d) Human resources management in the National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic: Elmira Alymkulova, National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic;

(e) Staff motivation at Statistics Netherlands: Wouter Jan van Muiswinkel, Statistics Netherlands.

16. The general discussion sessions included the following points:

(a) The use of internal versus external facilitators for staff motivation exercises;

(b) How to measure success, including increases of motivation and engagement;

(c) The effectiveness of using contractual provisions to require new staff, or those who have had a significant training investment, to remain in the organisation for a certain period of time;

(d) Good practices regarding the conduct of exit interviews;

(e) The importance of financial incentives as factors to increase motivation;

(f) The use of quotas for different performance assessments, including "unsatisfactory";

(g) Staff mobility as a means of reducing risks of corruption.

17. Small group discussions considered the main challenges, best practices and obstacles highlighted during the session. Points raised included:

1. Challenges:

(a) Financial, particularly the difficulty to provide competitive salaries;

(b) How to recognise good achievements, and implement a fair appraisal programme;

(c) How to improve teamwork;

(d) Communication within organisations, particularly on organisational goals;

(e) Ensuring objectivity in conflict management;

(f) Lack of promotion opportunities;

(g) Periods of high workload;

(h) Organisational culture, focusing on processes rather than results;

(i) How to develop managers and leaders, including how to develop career paths;

(j) How to make the national statistical organisation "brand" more appealing to potential recruits?

(k) National legal or policy restrictions on working practices and salaries;

(l) Lack of qualified staff.

2. **Good practices:**

(a) Regular one-to-one feedback between managers and staff (360-degree feedback);

(b) Measures to promote a good work/life balance;

(c) Internal networks for mentoring and coaching;

(d) Flexible working arrangements;

(e) Training programmes for new managers, including on communication with staff;

(f) Staff satisfaction surveys;

(g) Links to universities and schools to attract high-quality applicants;

(h) Learning paths for different groups of staff;

(i) Internal mobility possibilities;

(j) Regular meetings on management issues;

(k) Marketing to generate a positive image of the national statistical office as a good place to work;

(l) Planning for impact on staff of having children;

(m) "Open-door" policies when staff have individual offices.

3. **Obstacles:**

(a) Lack of resources;

(b) Internal conflicts;

(c) Use of assumptions and stereotypes about certain groups of staff;

(d) Lack of time for managers to spend with staff;

(e) Good experts are not necessarily good managers.

D. Session 4: Managing Human Resources in the context of modernization

18. The following six topics were presented:

(a) From planning change to getting cooperation and trust: the role of internal communication: Fabrizio Rotundi and Angela Leonetti, Istat;

(b) Human resources management in modern statistics: Janusz Dygaszewicz, CSO of Poland;

(c) Managing human resources in the context of modernisation: Bojana Radojevic, Statistical Office of Montenegro;

(d) Integrating tools for managing modernisation of statistical production in Poland – acquiring new skills and competencies: Agnieszka Komar-Morawska, CSO of Poland;

(e) Modernising national statistical offices – what, how and results: Martin Lagerström, Statistics Sweden;

(f) Workload analysis at the regional offices: Zübeyir ÖZÇELİK, Turkstat.

19. The general discussion sessions included the following points:

(a) The effectiveness of providing written versus oral information. An oral overview, with more detailed information in writing for those that need it, could be most effective;

(b) Levels of resistance at different stages of modernisation;

(c) The importance of avoiding jargon, or at least providing a glossary of key terms, to ensure common understanding;

(d) The importance of involving communications specialists when important information is shared;

(e) Should change be driven from the top-down, or from the bottom-up? A mixed approach may be most successful;

(f) How to keep skills and competency profiles up to date when roles change;

(g) The extent to which recruitment, training and mobility can be used to fill competency gaps;

(h) How to deal with both deficiencies and surpluses of competencies;

(i) At which point of the modernisation process is coaching most effective for managers and for staff?

(j) How to measure the often intangible return on investment for coaching activities?

(k) How to ensure effective communication on the benefits of change from managers;

(l) Methodology to measure workloads.

20. Small group discussions considered the main challenges, best practices and obstacles highlighted during the session. Points raised included:

1. Challenges:

(a) Lack of data analytics skills;

(b) Finding people with the right management skills to lead and manage change, and become "change agents";

(c) Lack of a clear vision for the future;

(d) Insufficient communication at all levels;

(e) Building the necessary capabilities and defining new competency frameworks;

(f) Helping staff to feel involved in modernisation activities, and to understand the need for change;

(g) Overcoming fear of change;

(h) Budget cuts;

(i) Adapting to new data sources, particularly big Data;

(j) Implementing the Generic Statistical Business Process Model;

(k) Changing organisation structure and need to re-profile staff skills requirements;

(l) Lack of finances to engage external experts.

2. Best practices:

(a) Use of Big Data and data science profiles for teams and team leaders;

(b) Taking a holistic view in the context of total quality management;

(c) Competence based human resource management;

(d) Clear, two-way communication, using all appropriate channels, including intranet;

(e) Mechanisms to share expertise;

(f) Establishing "change leaders";

(g) Ensuring full and clear support of top managers;

(h) Coaching of individuals, managers and groups to help them better understand their roles in the change process,

(i) Demonstrating the benefits of change;

(j) Consider hiring external expertise where appropriate;

(k) Standard methods to calculate costs of production, values of outputs, workloads and returns on investments;

(l) Increasing transparency.

3. Obstacles:

(a) Lack of understanding of modernisation goals;

(b) Lack of active listening skills to understand concerns of employees;

(c) Different attitudes of different groups or generations of staff. Some are more resistant to change than others;

(d) Lack of flexibility to respond to emerging ideas and requirements;

(e) Limited financial and human resources;

(f) Heavy workloads;

(g) Good specialists are not necessarily good managers;

(h) Staff staying too long in one role;

(i) Re-training to develop new skills needed for modernisation;

(j) Development of information technologies;

(k) Legislative basis.

E. Session 5: Organizational barriers to international cooperation in the context of HRMT

21. The members of the Modernisation Committee on Organisational Framework and Evaluation presented the topic of overcoming organization barriers to international collaboration. Initially, there were 12 barriers identified. Then, the barriers were prioritised and narrowed down to 4 which were descried in details:

- Lack of coordination inside statistical offices;
- Human and financial resources;
- Stakeholder engagement;
- Lack of coordination between organizations.

22. For each barrier, the description, existing good practices, and potential solutions have been identified by the task team and can be found at: http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=41259#/.

23. The participants were asked to provide inputs and comments on the draft paper. The comments were incorporated and the final version of the paper was presented at the HLG-MOS Workshop in Geneva in November 2016.

24. During the discussion the following points were raised:

(a) Legal framework of international cooperation;

(b) Marketing of the HLG-MOS and the concept of international cooperation;

(c) To include inter-relations between barriers in the list;

(d) There is a perception that international activities are not known among employees;

(e) Internal/external communication of international cooperation should be addressed;

(f) To see how results of international activities are implemented afterwards in the organisation.

25. Examples of good practices:

(a) Italy: The international relations office has a website to which all people working on international activities have access, it is a valuable tool for internal communication;

(b) Kyrgyzstan: After a workshop, it is mandatory to make report of the workshop and present it in front of the heads of departments. This includes topics discussed during the workshop and what could be implemented afterwards in the statistical organization;

(c) Poland: Reports of workshops are prepared by the employees who attended them. If an employee attends training, he/she must prepare a special presentation to

share the knowledge acquired. Every year, the international cooperation department prepares a plan for international activities for the given year, and afterwards presents a report on how it was implemented;

(d) Netherlands: Reports to directors on workshops, sharing of links to workshop materials, presentations on what was covered during the workshops and what good practices could be implemented in the office;

(e) Luxembourg: Reports of meetings presented to the top managers, who decide which practices could be implemented in the office.

F. Session 6: Capabilities development

26. This session included the following presentations:

(a) Introduction to capabilities: Steven Vale and Alice Kovarikova, UNECE;

(b) Training and change management: competencies development to support the modernisation process at Istat: Antonio Ottaiano, Istat;

(c) Strengthening analytical potential of official statistics: Magdalena Ambroch and Justuna Gustyn, CSO of Poland, Magdalena Ambroch and Justuna Gustyn, CSO of Poland;

(d) Training program for managers. Taking Lean one step further: Anne Trolie, Statistics Norway.

27. The general discussions included the following points:

(a) It is important to integrate communication and training. In Istat communication is embedded in the training program;

(b) Internal experts are often used to provide training, they are not necessarily certified, but they base their training on their work and knowledge. In Istat internal trainers are paid for the trainings that they provide, but this practice is under revision now;

(c) When an organization is going through changes, a capability program helps to focus. Staff are an important dimension of capability, so if the organisation needs more capability in IT, it can recruit/train more staff in this area;

(d) It is not easy to measure results of training activities, for the moment only satisfaction of people involved in the training is measured;

(e) Competence profiles are completed by employees, to consolidate information on knowledge, experience and interests but not soft skills;

(f) Motivation to become a trainer - to encourage staff to develop new ideas;

(g) To use 360 degree assessment and self-assessment for managers.

G. Session 7: Summary of the workshop and concluding remarks

28. Small group discussions considered the 3 most important areas for international collaboration work on human resources management and training. Points raised included:

(a) Common measures of return on investment;

(b) Competencies profiles for managers and specialists;

(c) Common e-learning courses that could be shared;

(d) Network of international coaches' trainers;

(e) Measuring training effects - how to get best results;

(f) Competencies – different sets and levels of competencies for GSBPM implementations, and fitting with the capability model. How to integrate both models;

(g) To establish a HR knowledge exchange platform;

(h) Coaching for managers, key drivers for change, coaches for employees done by management;

(i) Competence profiles;

(j) Communication: horizontal and vertical;

(k) Communication – transparent and clear, to motivate staff to change;

(l) Motivation of employees;

(m) Consequence of legislation – many initiatives dedicated to HR;

(n) Measuring activities with a consolidated approach;

(o) Exchange of best practices in order to achieve quality of statistical products;

(p) Development of analytical skills and leadership qualities;

(q) Implementation of best practices, relevant for the national statistical system;

(r) Development of competencies, standardised document that can include all core skills for statisticians.

29. Proposals identified to consider for future work included:

(a) Measure of return on investment; training impact; effect on people; organisations;

(b) Competency profiles for managers and specialists; link to the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM);

(c) Key skills for statisticians; motivation;

(d) Coaching for managers / employees;

(e) Common e-learning courses / webinars;

(f) HR knowledge exchange platform / exchange of best practices;

(g) Communication: horizontal / vertical & transparency.

H. Session 8: Special Session for the EECCA countries: How to attract competent staff and to provide accurate training for the future development of staff

30. During the first round table discussion on what could be implemented in the countries from the issues discussed during the workshop, the following points were raised:

(a) Important to implement coaching of managers in the organisations, not all specialists are good managers. Coaching can also be an incentive for young specialists to stay in the organisation longer;

(b) Internal communication, to help to share new information with the employees;

(c) Creating competency profiles for managers, statisticians and other employees;

(d) Staff motivation – very important in human resource management;

(e) Update of e-learning programs, based on what was discussed at the workshop;

(f) Important to implement Guidelines for Managers;

(g) Internal communication between managers and employees;

(h) Standardization of the HR;

(i) Accountability of working time, used in the presentation from Turkey, how to calculate number of employees required for organisation;

(j) Implement meetings of leaders with new employees, to help them with the practical aspects (like housing etc.) and to hear about what is important for them;

(k) Informal communication with managers;

(l) Examples of dealing with budget cuts;

(m) Employee satisfaction survey, could be used to increase motivation of the employees, especially if there is a follow up on the results of the survey;

(n) Work life balance, and flexible working arrangements – also could be used to increase motivation.

31. Countries were encouraged to prepare implementation plans and report on progress at the next HRMT meeting.

32. The UNECE presented recent work on developing modernisation maturity models. This approach was considered useful to help statistical organisations identify their starting point, and identify competencies to be developed to move to higher levels of maturity.

33. A second round-table discussion on future HRMT priorities identified the following points:

(a) Support for implementation of the GSBPM;

(b) A workshop on risk management;

(c) Support for skills and competencies development;

(d) More opportunities to share good practices on HRMT with other statistical organisations;

(e) Methodological support and training on HR issues, e.g. raising the quality of statistical staff;

(f) Strengthen quality culture in all phases of statistical production, and more interaction with users;

(g) Training on change management for managers and staff;

(h) Support for changing organisational structures;

(i) Development of e-learning materials.

United Nations ECE/CES/2017/15/Add.4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2017

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session
Geneva, 19-21 June 2017
Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016

Addendum

Report of the Workshop on Implementing Standards for Statistical Modernisation

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The Workshop on Implementing Standards for Statistical Modernisation was held on 21-23 September 2016 in Geneva.

The addendum is the report of that workshop and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians on the implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016 in regards to its outcomes and recommendations.

GE.17-09469(E)
1709469

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Workshop on Implementing Standards for Statistical Modernisation was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 21–23 September 2016. Participants in this workshop comprised representatives from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, as well as representatives from the African Development Bank, Eurasian Economic Commission, European Central Bank, International Labour Organization, International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the Statistical Office of the European Commission (Eurostat).

II. Organization of the seminar

2. Ms. L. Bratanova and Mr. S. Vale, UNECE Statistical Division, opened the workshop. Mr. K. Blomqvist of Sweden chaired the workshop.

3. The workshop was divided into five sessions, each of which addressed a particular topic related to Implementing Standards for Statistical Modernisation, as follows:

(a) Implementing the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM) and the Generic Activity Model for Statistical Organizations (GAMSO);

(b) Implementing the Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM);

(c) Implementing the Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA);

(d) Developing a roadmap for statistical modernisation and a Modernisation Maturity Model; and

(e) Updates on other standards relevant for modernising official statistics.

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the meeting

4. Key items to be consider for future work include:

(a) Geospatial information standards;

(b) The metadata glossary (the GSBPM part);

(c) Metadata types / roles (for example revisiting the Bo Sundgren paper);

(d) Logical Information Model (LIM) variables;

(e) Quality Indicators for GSBPM concerning data derived from administrative sources;

(f) Providing explanatory material for GSBPM;

(g) Publishing and maintaining the Modernisation Roadmap;

(h) Planning the revision of GSBPM, GSIM and GAMSO;

(i) Monitoring relevant related standards; and

(j) Cooperation with SDMX (Statistical and Technical Working Groups)

5. Two project proposals to be prepared for consideration by the High-level Group for Modernisation are:

(a) Linking the Statistical Data and Metadata eXchange (SDMX) and Data Documentation Initiative (DDI) artefacts to CSPA; and

(b) CSPA data architecture.

A. Session 1: Implementing GSBPM and GAMSO

6. This topic was organized by Ms. A. Born (Canada) and Ms. J. Linnerud (Norway). It included the following presentations.

- Turkey - TurkStat's experiences on mapping non-statistical activities using GAMSO
- Eurostat - GAMSO in context
- Columbia - Modernisation of statistical production based in the analysis of the GSBPM
- Mexico - Spanish-language version of GSBPM
- Kyrgyzstan - Implementing the GSBPM and metadata system at the National Statistics Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic
- Spain - National adaptation of GSBPM and its application in the development of a process metadata model
- UNECE Quality Indicators group - Enhancing GSBPM: Quality Indicators and uses of administrative data
- Canada - The Record Linkage Project Process Model (RLPPM)
- OECD - Checklist for SDMX Design Projects using GSBPM

7. The following points were raised in the discussions:

(a) The need for statisticians and IT specialists to work together on modernisation projects.

(b) That translations of standards require maintenance, and that linguistic considerations can make it hard to describe certain ideas in other languages, or even in different countries dialect of the same language (e.g., for Spanish). – In the context of GAMSO, Capability Management is one area that is difficult to translate into other languages, although improvements to the explanatory text should help this to be more broadly understandable.

(c) Some participants requested more explanation of the "Capability Management" activity area of GAMSO. In GAMSO, the decision to develop or improve a capability is initiated within the Strategy and Leadership area, where the task is then handed over to the Capacity Management area (for example to build a new tool), before being handed over to the Corporate Support area to provide ongoing maintenance (e.g., training users, etc.).

(d) It was suggested that some terms, such as "support function" are not used consistently between GAMSO and GSBPM.

(e) There is need for revision of the overarching elements within GSBPM v5.0, in order to make it consistent with GAMSO.

(f) GAMSO v1.0 is currently in the process of review, and due consideration is being given to other standards from the HLG and outside (e.g. The Open Group

Architecture Forum (TOGAF), Eurostat Enterprise Architecture, etc.). However, GAMSO must be more easily readable than for instance TOGAF for non-IT staff in statistical organizations.

(g) Work is already underway on a glossary for statistical metadata, which should provide common descriptions of terms used in GSBPM. There is also work underway looking at variables in GSIM, and across the GSBPM.

(h) For the next phase of work on GSBPM Quality Indicators concerning administrative-derived data, there will be the opportunity to feed into this work through the next consultation process, or more directly by volunteering to join the group that will be working on this project.

(i) Regarding improvement of the descriptions of GSBPM sub-processes in the context of administrative data, participants were encourages to make use of the GSBPM discussion forum to post suggestions for improvement to these descriptions.

(j) Record linkage may require the recording of more metadata.

(k) The checklist for SDMX design projects has been implemented in the guidelines, and is hosted on the UNECE wiki site. This work demonstrates a good example of GSBPM-SDMX integration.

B. Topic (ii) Implementing the GSIM

8. This topic was organized by K. Blomqvist (Sweden). It included the following presentations:

(a) Sweden - RUT (Register Utiliser Tool) - A Practical implementation of GSIM as support in register-based research

(b) Norway - Presentation of a new GSIM-based system for managing classifications and codelists

(c) Italy - GSIM and the Sistema Unitario dei Metadati (SUM): State of application of the standard

(d) Denmark - Fulfilling user-needs and improving quality and efficiency GSIM and other standards

(e) Sweden - Statistics Sweden GSIM Case Study

9. The following points were raised in the discussion:

(a) There was discussion about systems for managing classifications, in terms of managing revisions to and variants of classifications, but also managing classifications that are common to multiple sources of data (e.g., sex of individual or non-response reasons).

(b) In some circumstances (e.g., where data is received from multiple countries) different versions of classifications (such as the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC)) may need to coexist. However in national systems, this situation can often be avoided, and the date considered determines which version is used.

(c) For data obtained from public registers (held outside of the statistical office), obtaining quality information can be challenging.

(d) Using large classification tree structures in a web-accessed classification management system can be costly in terms of memory usage. The systems described in the presentations used fixed rather than floating classifications.

(e) There was discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of incorporating codelists into classification management systems. The main disadvantage is the large number of codelists, some of which may only apply to a single dataset.

(f) Incorporating codelists requires decisions about how far to go in trying to document the large number of them, but also raises questions about harmonisation (e.g., codes for yes/no/don't know responses), but also about whether data providers could be forced to use certain families of codelists.

(g) Some counties have a dedicated unit that approves the creation of new codelists in an effort to minimise the number.

(h) It was suggested that the best way forward might be to start with the concepts, and to save the logic, rather than the codelists themselves.

(i) Estonia gave an example of how unit type could be variable depending on the question of interest. – GSIM is able to handle multiple unit types if a parent-child relationship is created to distinguish them. Another option is combinations of unit types and variables.

(j) More guidance on implementing GSIM was called for, especially as many organizations do not have metadata specialists to consider these questions in depth. This would also help to promote GSIM, and to make it easier to secure financial approval for implementation projects. It is anticipated that this will be addressed by the Roadmap project, which is currently underway. However implementation is more of a design issue for the implementer, than something that can be specified within a generic model.

(k) Having a set of core GSIM objects might be helpful for those embarking on GSIM implementation. There was also a suggestion for GSIM to move toward describing dimensional data sets. Whilst a particular organisation can pick out the elements they need from GSIM, classifications and variables are important aspects of GSIM for those implementing it.

(l) Those who had experience of developing a core set of GSIM objects (Denmark, Italy, Norway and Sweden) were encouraged to share their experiences via comments in the Clickable GSIM (http://www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/GSIMclick).

(m) It was suggested that a software implementation of GSIM might encourage implementation in the same way that software applications (such as Colectica) may have boosted implementation of DDI.

(n) It was suggested that correspondence tables could be used to communicate metadata (e.g., classifications and codelists) to users. – Particularly researchers, who are a very important group of users.

(o) The importance of incorporating geospatial information within GSIM was highlighted.

C. Topic (iii) Implementing CSPA

10. This topic was organized by Mr. D. Barraclough (OECD) and Mr. A. Hamilton (Australia). It included the following presentations:

(a) Australia - Using CSPA to transform Data Acquisition;

(b) Sweden - Summary of GSIM Statistical Classifications;

(c) OECD - The Logical Information Model and variables.

11. The following points were raised in the discussions:

(a) In the case of Australia's use of CSPA for data acquisition, an integration partner was contracted, who will integrate three software products. A best of breed solution was chosen.

(b) The Australian transformation programme requires identification of benefits from projects, and savings of around AUD$10 million on data acquisition are expected, mainly due to reduction of field staff. It is possible that the service specifications can be shared from this work.

(c) The importance of using the same capability to perform a function (wherever that function is performed) is a part of an organization's target operating model.

(d) Clear guidelines were called for on the boundary between GSIM and LIM. Whilst GSIM needs to be stable, a clear set of principles is needed on LIM. One approach might be to follow the data through the GSBPM processes, and to consider what concepts are required at each stage. It may be useful to involve other parts of an organization when developing conceptual models.

(e) It was suggested that LIM and GSIM should link to or distinguish between micro- and macro-data. However, in some cases (e.g., national accounts), statistics may be derived from semi-aggregated data, rather than microdata.

(f) Consistency between LIM and DDI/SDMX was called for. More references to GSIM in the SDMX guidelines might be useful.

(g) Codelists used in SDMX and GSIM classifications are not exactly the same thing: Whilst a codelist could correspond to a variant of a classification, several variants may be needed (e.g., for national accounts). A classification database can be used to generate codelists.

(h) In GSIM, it is possible to create a value domain for a given variable.

(i) Countries should be able to adopt these standards at their own pace, in line with the aims of the Roadmap project.

12. Following the presentations, there was a panel session, moderated by Mr. D. Barraclough (OECD) and comprising Mr. D. Grofils (Eurostat), Ms. E. Holm (Sweden) and Ms. R. Piela (Finland) as panel members. The following points were raised at during the panel session:

(a) How do we move from a new requirement to the specification of a CSPA service?

i. At the moment, one has to choose between using a service in the catalogue, look for partners to share the cost of developing a CSPA service, or can build their own. There are not yet many services available in the CSPA catalogue, so maybe ways of cataloguing requirements should be examined.

(b) What is the difference between Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) and CSPA?

i. It was pointed out that CSPA is not the same thing as a Service Oriented Architecture, and that it comprises more than just common interfaces. Key

components include standard structures for business functions and information objects involved in statistical services.

(c) How can we be sure that CSPA services do what they say on the tin, and trust that they are of a sufficient quality?

i. Candidate services are reviewed by the CSPA group, and documentation is required for the CSPA service, in order to better understand what that CSPA service is doing. This helps to ensure that the service is not a duplication of one which already exists in the catalogue, as well as helping to understand its level of granularity;

ii. Information is provided to assist with implementation, including information on LIM. Since LIM is developed as needed, the service vendor should provide support to the service;

iii. Whilst the specification should be related to GSIM, service developers might find this hard to understand;

iv. The term "CSPA compliant" was describes as ensuring that terminology/vocabulary does not contradict other standards (e.g., GSIM) which are overseen by the High-Level Group for the Modernisation of Official Statistics (HLG-MOS), and the standardisation of its inputs and outputs, as well as its "Plug and Play" nature. Utility services related to a specific area of corporate support would not normally be considered to be a CSPA service.

(d) How do we increase the number of organizations which implement CSPA?

i. Support from Governments for CSPA would be very useful, but on the other hand if there is a sizable modernisation community, this community can support its implementation: It is then a question of whether people decide to implement it or not;

ii. One selling point is that for decentralised national statistical systems, CSPA offers benefits even within that country. Similarly, if you have implemented GSIM, then a moderate amount of extra effort will bring the benefits associated with CSPA;

iii. It is important to take a lifecycle view of the advantages and disadvantages of CSPA within your organization;

iv. If you are sharing a CSPA component, you will have an extra responsibility to maintain it because you know that other people are then relying upon it. It is important to vi

v. Early adopters may get less benefit than those who adopt it later.

(e) Say that we have a business requirement for a new service: How should one decide whether to reuse an existing service, collaborate with someone building a new service, or develop a new service entirely?

i. The first step is to consult methodologists on the soundness of the methodology, and to consult IT staff about its suitability (e.g., is it built using obsolete technology?);

ii. The crucial deciding factor on adoption is that key statistical outputs (such as national accounts) cannot be delivered late, and that responsibilities are clear in the event that a delay occurs;

iii. Another key consideration is whether senior managers are willing to pay the costs of building a new CSPA service.

(f) How can our enterprise architectures evolve to incorporate CSPA services?

i. Mapping services to functions in business processes should offer new opportunities to incorporate CSPA services in enterprise architectures;

ii. At the last CSPA hackathon, there was work on orchestration, to see how a service could be plugged into an enterprise architecture.

(g) What are the plans for further developing the CSPA standard (to maintain models, or to make it easier to use)?

i. A key element will be work on LIM to facilitate CSPA implementation. LIM is a more specified version of GSIM;

ii. More documentation and good demonstrations of particular CSPA implementations would be useful, as well as a template for developers;

iii. It was suggested that another CSPA hackathon might be useful;

iv. Trust is important for developing shared services;

v. Eurostat is already in the process of developing shared services;

vi. It terms of the relationship between CSPA and SDMX/DDI, CSPA is more a set of standard interfaces for development of services (e.g., attribute levels and polymorphism), rather than an implementation standard itself. However, CSPA does recommend SDMX as a data transfer protocol. The compatibility of CSPA with SDMX/DDI can be established by mapping GSIM to DDI and SDMX.

(h) What are the main obstacles to CSPA implementation, and how to overcome them?

i. The need for more accessible information, to raise awareness of CSPA. Simple demonstrations of creating a CSPA service (such as wrapping an R package in CSPA) would be useful;

ii. The length of time needed to produce a CSPA service is a challenge;

iii. CSPA is competing with existing marketplaces for algorithms. – These have an advantage in that you don't have to do version management. Top managements often prefer the guarantee offered by commercial services;

iv. It was noted that the CSPA repository on the European Commission website is currently hidden behind a login screen, which might deter some would-be users of CSPA;

v. Including the class library templates and service implementation description should make CSPA services easier for developers to use in their organizations;

vi. There are already some success stories, such as the CSPA service developed to transform SDMX messages (used to make correspondence to local production systems);

(i) How can we measure the successfulness of CSPA?

i. Initially, a simple test of successfulness is simply that two organizations are using a CSPA service created by a third organization;

ii. Other measures of success that were suggested included that CSPA service providers can fix any bugs within a day, or the number of participants at CSPA meetings.

D. Topic (iv) Developing a roadmap for statistical modernisation and a Modernisation Maturity Model.

13. This topic was organized by Ms. A. Born (Canada) and Ms. J. Linnerud (Norway). It included the following presentation and was followed by a groupwork exercise to test the Modernisation Maturity Model (MMM). During the discussion that followed the testing of the MMM, the following points were raised.

1. Feedback from the GAMSO group

(a) Not all organizations are aligned to GAMSO, and there are a number of country-specific adaptations of this standard. The interpretation (in the context of GAMSO) of some dimensions is easier than others, and the most important dimension for assessing the maturity of GAMSO implementation should be the "Business" dimension;

(b) The relation of GAMSO to GSBPM should be made more explicit.

2. Feedback from the GSBPM group

(a) Some participants felt that the descriptions required elaboration, and used IT-oriented language. Some in this group had difficulty with the descriptions of some of the dimensions (e.g., Applications, Information);

(b) The version of GSBPM that maturity is being assessed against should be taken into account.

3. Feedback from the GSIM group

(a) Some slight refinement of the text for consistency would be useful;

(b) There was difficulty in interpreting some of the dimensions (e.g., Business, Methods) in the context of GSIM;

(c) It is also difficult to consider GSIM in isolation with other standards;

(d) Some participants felt unable to respond to some cells in the assessment matrix (some combinations of level and dimensions);

(e) More explanation was called for.

14. The final morning of the workshop began with a panel on the Roadmap to modernisation, moderated by Mr. S. Vale (UNECE), and composed of Ms. E. Kaukonen (Finland), Ms. M. Signore (Italy), and Ms. T. Šijanec (Slovenia) as panel members. Each panel member made a presentation on the modernisation story within their organization, followed by discussions. The following points were made in these discussions:

(a) The current Roadmap project is underway, and has delivered a Modernisation Maturity Model (MMM), which is used for benchmarking an organization's maturity level. The next phase of work on the Roadmap project will identify

instruments that can help statistical organizations to raise their level of maturity from the initial level, to a higher level, in a given standard (GAMSO, GSBPM, GSIM, CSPA).

(b) A mapping of an organization's activities to GAMSO can be one way of understanding an organization's maturity level with respect to this standard. Some organizations then create code lists for each activity identified through the mapping process.

(c) The same is true for GSBPM, since both GAMSO and GSBPM are abstract models which one might map to a given national situation. Part of the benefit of these standards is that the mapping process helps to identify areas that could be rationalised.

(d) GAMSO can also be used for modelling cost allocation, and for mapping quality indicators.

(e) For quality indicators, version 1.0 of the GSBPM Quality Indicators has been released, which concerns data derived from surveys. The next phase of work will consider indicators for data obtained from administrative sources.

(f) Some participants (Finland, Slovenia) felt that revising GSBPM was not as important as work on other standards, other than work on the overlap with GAMSO.

(g) It was explained that there were plans to review GAMSO, GSBPM and GSIM as a block in 2018, but only if there was enough agreement to do this, plus a strong business case.

(h) For the time being, those wishing to suggest changes to the textual descriptions of GSBPM sub-processes could post comments in the GSBPM discussion forum.

(i) In terms of suggestions for possible outputs of the Roadmap project, to assist organizations at different stages on the journey to modernisation, the following suggestions were made:

i. Further opportunities for exchange of experiences and training;

ii. Identification of common challenges;

iii. A checklist of benefits realised;

iv. Short online videos; and

v. More promotion of the online case studies.

(a) It was emphasised that the tools outputted from the Roadmap project should allow organizations to take what they need to allow them to modernise at their own pace. They should be available on the web;

(b) It was also pointed out that a lot of good material is already available on the UNECE wiki pages, such as Clickable GSIM. One suggestion made was to have more outreach to non-UNECE countries;

(c) The session organizer thanked the participants for their feedback from the group work to test the MMM. – This feedback will be considered in future work on the Roadmap.

E. Topic (v) Updates on other standards relevant for modernising official statistics

15. This topic was organized by Mr Juan Múñoz López (Mexico), and took the format of two separate panel sessions. The first panel was composed of Mr Guillaume Duffes (France) and Ms Marie Haldorsen (Sweden), who made the following presentations:

(a) The DDI Questionnaire Generator (France); and

(b) Connections between Geospatial data and Standards (Sweden).

16. The following points were raised in the discussion:

(a) Eurostat's Vision 2020 projects attempt to integrate various different standards, including work on statistical units. Geospatial information should be connected to this work;

(b) The GEOSTAT 2 projects aims to propose a European version of a statistical framework for geospatial data. However, more interaction is needed with statistical standards, and greater collaboration with the United Nations Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management (UN-GGIM);

(c) It may be fruitful to link geospatial information to GSIM, as well as GSBPM;

(d) Regarding the DDI Questionnaire Generator, this requires DDI Lifecycle v3.2 and above as a prerequisite. If your organization used DDI Codebook, Colectica can edit this;

(e) It is desirable to be able to integrate categories, concepts and codelists in the metadata supplied to data users, for example in Resource Description Framework (RDF) form.

17. The second panel was composed of Mr. David Barraclough (OECD), Mr. Guillaume Duffes (France) and Mr. Marco Pellegrino (Eurostat), who made the following presentations:

(a) Recent developments in SDMX (OECD);

(b) Validation and Transformation Language (VTL) and the Statistical Data Catalogue standard for open data portals (StatDCAT) (Eurostat); and

(c) Linked Open Metadata (France).

18. The following points were raised in the discussion

(a) Recent developments on SDMX included:

(b) Proposals for Global Metadata Structure Definitions, to help map between local and global SDMX structures;

(c) Clickable SDMX, to allow navigation between concepts;

(d) Checklists for SDMX design projects, and for data reporters;

(e) A methodology for versioning of SDMX artefacts; and

(f) Guidelines for reporting on a non-annual cycle, time transformations, and confidentiality and embargo.

(g) StatDCAT is a specialised version of DCAT for statistics. Further coordination of this work is needed with a range of statistical and non-statistical stakeholders at both the country level and international level.

(h) For Linked Open Metadata, it was suggested that there could be synergies with work on StatDCAT and Quality Indicators for GSBPM. Further work is needed on using the Single Integrated Metadata Structure (SIMS) for deriving a data quality vocabulary for StatDCAT. Further work needs to be done on the draft RDF data quality vocabulary. It was suggested incorporating the use of RDF with the GSBPM.

(i) Work that is ongoing on LIM will consider VTL reference materials.

(j) SIMS is using RDF, so offers opportunities for quality reporting, but it is undecided whether to use a flat structure or more complex structure for this. The GSBPM Quality Indicators group might benefit from consulting Eurostat on this question.

(k) It might also be worth reviewing the proposals on Global Metadata Structure Definitions in light of developments on SIMS and StatDCAT.

(l) Work on these standards is adapting to new technologies in a number of ways, such as adoption of RDF for dissemination. Linking to the semantic web/linked open data movements is a good way to connect to much larger communities.

(m) SDMX is establishing links to other standards, such as CSPA and GSIM.

19. The chair thanked participants and organizers. The UNECE Secretariat thanked the chair and the organizers for their contribution to the workshop.

United Nations ECE/CES/2017/15/Add.5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2017

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session
Geneva, 19-21 June 2017
Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda
Programme of work of the Statistics subprogramme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016

Addendum

Report of the Joint OECD/UNECE Seminar on the Implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA)

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The second Joint OECD/UNECE Seminar on the Implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) was held on 3-4 October 2016 in Geneva.

The addendum is the report of that Seminar and is provided to inform the Conference of European Statisticians on the implementation of the UNECE Statistical Programme 2016 in regards to its outcomes and recommendations.

GE.17-09471(E)

1709471

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Joint OECD/UNECE Seminar on the Implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) was held in Geneva on 3-4 October 2016. It was jointly organized with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and an organising committee with members from Australia, Canada, Kyrgyzstan, the Netherlands, Sweden and Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat).

2. Experts from the following countries attended the meeting: Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States of America.

3. Also representatives of the Eurasian Economic Commission (EEC), Eurostat, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UN FAO), the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD), the World Bank, and the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) attended the meeting.

4. The non-governmental organizations Institute Cadaster and Luc Hoffmann Institute/WWF International were also represented at the meeting.

5. From the private sector, Aether Espana SL attended the meeting.

II. Organization of the seminar

6. Mr. K. Roberts (Statistics Canada) chaired the seminar.

7. The participants adopted the agenda of the seminar.

8. The following substantive topics were discussed at the seminar:

   a) Session 1: Overview on activities of international organizations

   b) Session 2: SEEA and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

   c) Session 3: Applications of SEEA and their communication.

   d) Session 4: Implementation of SEEA modules: challenges and solutions

      i. Session 4a: Energy and air emission accounts

      ii. Session 4b: Environmental taxes and subsidies.

   e) Session 5: Conclusions and recommendations for future work

   f) On 3 October 2016, a lunchtime presentation on Earth Observation for Ecosystem Accounting (EO4EA) was given by the co-chair of the GEO Program Board.

9. Session Chairs were Mr. A. de la Fuente (Eurostat, session 1), Mr. K. Roberts (Statistics Canada, session 2), Mr. M. Lound (Australian Bureau of Statistics, first part of session 3), Mr. M. Wright (Statistics Canada, second part of session 3), Mr. G. Eding (Statistics Netherlands, session 4a), Ms. K. Ben Daher (Statistics Sweden, session 4b) and Mr. P. van de Ven (OECD, session 5).

III. Summary of the discussion and main conclusions reached at the meeting

A. Session 1: Overview on activities of international organizations

10. The session informed about current and planned activities of international organizations related to SEEA implementation in the CES member countries, covering the activities of Eurostat, FAO, the Group Earth Observation (GEO), the International Energy Agency (IEA), OECD, UNDP, UNECE, UNEP, UNESCAP, UNSD, and the World Bank. Furthermore, the chair of the London Group on Environmental Accounting (LG) provided a summary of the main outcomes of the London Group meeting held on 28-30 September 2016.

11. The seminar participants considered continuation of taking stock of international organizations' activities in the region (e.g., in form of a regularly updated inventory) very important. Furthermore, coordination of SEEA-related capacity building is considered crucial, as the relevant activities of international organizations in the UNECE region address different country groups that partly overlap.

12. The secretariat presented the first ideas for developing a regional SEEA implementation strategy. The strategy will take into account the global SEEA implementation strategy, the Framework for the Development of Environment Statistics (FDES) Blueprint for Action as well as strategies and activities of other international organizations in the region. It will form the basis for a regional SEEA implementation plan and capacity building activities.

B. Session 2: SEEA and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

13. The session considered the conceptual links between SEEA and the SDG indicators, and how SEEA could be further promoted in the context of measuring and monitoring SDGs. UNSD made a presentation in this session.

14. In 2014 the Statistical Commission has "recognized SEEA as an important statistical framework for the post-2015 development agenda and the sustainable development goals indicators" (Report of the forty-fifth session). The System of National Accounts (SNA) and SEEA are statistical standards that can be used to monitor a number of environmental-economic SDG indicators in an integrated way.

15. Closer cooperation with the custodian agencies responsible for SDG indicators related to economy and environment is needed, to further promote the use of SEEA in the context of SDGs. A small subgroup of the UNCEEA will develop a strategy for promoting SEEA in the context of the SDGs and in statistics related to climate change, in particular concerning the methodologies and capacity building at the national level.

16. National Statistical Offices should be the focal points for all SDG indicators in countries, but coordinating and re-organizing existing data flows is a major challenge. Notwithstanding these challenges, it is considered important to make progress on this issue, as currently, in addition to official statistics, the information to compile SDG indicators is often produced by agencies outside the national statistical system. The role of NSOs in integrating the information in the SEEA framework was considered particularly important for the elevation of environmental information to the level of official statistics that meet the quality standards and are produced on a regular basis.

17. In the opinion of participants, the development of international databases with SEEA data is very important to promote a wider user of SEEA.

18. Building capacity and development of tools to support countries in the compilation of the accounts was also considered of primary importance.

C. Session 3: Applications of SEEA and their communication

19. The session on applications and communication of SEEA discussed examples from Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Eurostat presented the use of SEEA for resource efficiency policies in Europe and the Word Bank gave a presentation on challenges and opportunities related to Natural Capital Accounting.

20. The key success factors for better engaging with users (such as policy makers) are communication and the characteristics of the data offered by the statistical system.

21. The seminar participants agreed that it is challenging to engage with policymakers to demonstrate the value of the SEEA framework. SEEA is not being used to its full potential. In some areas, there is more information on offer than is currently demanded by policy makers. However, many countries noted an increasing interest in the accounts and their use in decision making.

22. For ensuring successful engagement of users, it was agreed that especially the following is needed: (a) "demystifying" SEEA accounts for users, as they are often seen as too complex; (b) extensive and persistent networking that showcases what can be done with SEEA data; (c) clear and concise communication through a range of media to get the message out to the user community; (d) securing "champions" to assist in delivering the message to users, and (e) having timely data available to support policy questions.

23. SEEA is communicated through a range of channels including traditional publications, web sites, seminars and conferences, social media and advisory groups. Nevertheless, several participants noted that SEEA is less known than other areas of statistics.

24. Engaging with Public Relations Departments and putting in place a clear communication strategy are considered important. Some countries have already gained experience with different communication channels for SEEA products, but in most countries this is still at an early stage of development.

25. Open data policies can help to get the attention of users.

26. Users often ask for data sets which are complete, and can be disaggregated into industries and subnational areas. One important challenge in this respect may be related to statistical confidentiality.

27. Integration of accounts provides benefits for users, but they are often not aware of it.

28. Users may not be interested in certain modules, because they are used to use other sources of information. NSOs have to analyse what they are going to lose in case they suspend modules.

29. Some countries noted that in cases where there is a clear user demand, this also helped to implement measures to improve timeliness of the accounts.

30. As policy analysts and researchers are often interested in international comparisons and benchmarking, efforts should be strengthened to have certain SEEA accounts produced by a majority of countries.

31. It was noted that policy needs should be anticipated to the extent possible, to be able to adequately prepare the compilation of relevant statistics and accounts, which often may take a longer period of time.

32. Another important point is to ensure the integration and consistency across SEEA accounts, because this is one of the major assets of SEEA.

33. Developing global datasets must be a priority. Air emission accounts, energy accounts, material flow accounts and land accounts were mentioned as areas for which conditions are favourable to get started. UNCEEA has already embarked on this path.

D. Session 4: Implementation of SEEA modules: challenges and solutions

34. The session discussed challenges and solutions concerning the implementation of air emission accounts, energy accounts (in the first part of the session), and environmental taxes and subsidies (in the second part of the session).

35. The session on energy and air emission accounts considered practical examples and country experiences in the implementation of the different modules. Four presentations were given, starting with an introduction on the (SEEA) principles of the energy and air emission accounts by the Netherlands, followed by a presentation by OECD discussing possible approaches to provide first estimates of CO_2 emission accounts according to SEEA for countries that do not yet compile them. Denmark and Kazakhstan presented country experiences and lessons learned.

36. The second part of the session on environmental taxes and subsidies provided an overview of conceptual, methodological and practical implementation aspects based on national examples from Italy and Sweden. OECD gave a presentation on the estimation of the volume of fossil fuel subsidies.

37. Energy and air emission accounts are often amongst the first SEEA accounts to be developed by countries, mainly due to their clear policy use and related user demands. In many cases they are "low hanging fruits", as in general quite a lot of data are available from energy balances, greenhouse gas emission inventories and inventories of air pollutants to compile these accounts. Accounts on environmental taxes and subsidies are less often produced.

38. Countries face a range of practical problems in compiling the accounts, mainly related to combining information from different data sources, with different data owners. Other challenges concern methodological issues, such as data interpolation to fill in the missing information.

39. All given examples showed that even with imperfect data it is possible to compile accounts that provide users with valuable and fit for purpose information. The start should be an assessment of available data and policy needs. This can provide a solid basis for defining future work programs for implementing the accounts.

40. When compiling the accounts for the first time it is best to move forward in a practical manner and start with the source information that is readily available. Subsequently, practical solutions to complete the missing information (e.g. using alternative data sources or proxies) can be developed. Using benchmark information from other countries or regions to fill in the missing data could be a feasible alternative.

41. A constant dialogue with the main users is very important in this process, to keep the gradual development of the accounts aligned with the users' needs and ensure that the resulting accounts are fit for purpose.

42. Understanding the nature of the underlying source statistics, their production process and methods, and building up good relationships between source data producers and environmental accountants are considered key for a successful development of SEEA accounts.

43. Seminar participants emphasised that the exchange of experiences and lessons learned is very useful and valuable and should be followed up in future, e.g. by special sessions at the next seminars and/or other (electronic) information exchange mechanisms.

E. Session 5: Conclusions and recommendations for future work

44. The session discussed and agreed on the main outcomes and decisions for further work, as presented below.

45. Joint OECD/UNECE Seminars on the Implementation of SEEA should continue to allow for exchange of practical experience, advancing the implementation, and discussing coordination issues among international agencies involved in SEEA-related work in the UNECE region. These seminars should be complementary to other international initiatives in this area.

46. The participants recommended that UNECE also uses this forum to identify the SEEA priority settings in the countries (e.g. with a survey to NSOs), and to develop a regional SEEA implementation plan. The plan should (a) contribute to the global SEEA implementation strategy, (b) take into consideration the identified priority setting, and (c) support the production of indicators for important global policy initiatives, such as the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

47. The next Joint OECD/UNECE Seminar on the Implementation of SEEA should be held in about a year's time, depending on the progress made in SEEA implementation and new developments that need to be discussed. Possible dates for the next seminar are 2-3 October 2017.

48. The organizing committee will consider how to better structure the future seminars to focus the different sessions more clearly on strategic issues, monitoring progress in implementation of the regional and national work plans, exchange of experience, links with other initiatives, etc.

49. The participants see a need to produce some tangible outputs from the seminars that would help countries in the practical implementation of SEEA. These outputs should be aligned with and complementary to outputs provided by UNSD and Eurostat, and could consist of the following:

(a) collecting and sharing good practices (success stories) and lessons learned in the implementation, communication and use of SEEA;

(b) providing concrete country examples on policy applications of SEEA;

(c) developing further guidance to assess the readiness to compile certain SEEA-accounts, taking into consideration the diagnostic tool for the SEEA Central Framework and the SEEA technical notes, and building on the global assessment carried out by UNSD under the auspices of UNCEEA;

(d) continue to keep participants updated on SEEA-related activities of international organizations in the UNECE region.

50. The format of future seminars should allow to:

(a) monitor and bring forward the regional and national SEEA implementation plans;

(b) inform about activities and outcomes of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Environmental-Economic Accounting (UNCEEA);

(c) discuss new developments, such as the extensions of SEEA modules;

(d) provide a forum to support the coordination of SEEA-related activities of international organizations;

(e) allow exchange of knowledge and experience on difficult issues related to the implementation of SEEA.

51. Some topics that could be considered at the next SEEA seminar are communication on the results that can be derived from SEEA, and improving the quality of energy and air emission accounts.